

City Council Meeting Minutes

**May 16, 2017
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street**

SPECIAL MEETING – EXECUTIVE SESSION 6:00 PM

Call to Order – Mayor Muckle called the special meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

City Council: *Mayor Robert Muckle
Mayor Pro Tem Jeff Lipton
Councilmember Jay Keany
Councilmember Chris Leh (arrived 6:45 pm)
Councilmember Susan Loo
Councilmember Dennis Maloney
Councilmember Ashley Stolzmann*

Staff Present: *Malcolm Fleming, City Manager
Heather Balser, Deputy City Manager
Kevin Watson, Finance Director
Aaron DeJong, Director of Economic Development
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk*

Others Present: *Sam Light, City Attorney
Berg & Hill*

PENDING LITIGATION

(Louisville Charter, Section 5-2(d) – Authorized Topics – Consultation with an attorney representing the City with respect to pending litigation, and C.R.S. 24-6-402(4)(b))

PERSONNEL MATTER – INTERIM CITY MANAGER CONTRACT

(Louisville Code of Ethics, Section 5-2(b), CRS 24-6-402(4)(f) – Authorized topics)

Mayor Muckle stated he and the City Manager are requesting the City Council convene an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing pending litigation. City Attorney Light introduced the request for executive session. Mayor Muckle stated he is also

City of Louisville

*City Council 749 Main Street Louisville CO 80027
303.335.4533 (phone) 303.335.4550 (fax) www.louisvilleco.gov*

requesting an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing a contract for the interim city manager.

City Attorney Light introduced the requests for executive session.

City Clerk Muth read Section 2.90.050 – Public statement of the Louisville Municipal Code, which outlines the topics permitted for discussion in an executive session.

City Attorney Light stated the authority to conduct this executive session for pending litigation: Louisville Code of Ethics, Section 5-2(d), CRS 24-6-402(4)(b) – Authorized topics; City Attorney Light stated the authority to conduct this executive session for the personnel matter: Louisville Code of Ethics, Section 5-2(b), CRS 24-6-402(4)(f) – Authorized topics.

The City Manager and City Attorney are asking for an executive session concerning pending litigation which in this case involves one pending lawsuit and one situation where a lawsuit may result.

MOTION 1: Mayor Muckle moved the City Council adjourn to executive session for the purpose of consultation with attorneys representing the City with respect to pending litigation as authorized by the laws noted by the City Attorney and the executive session include the City Council, the City Attorney, the City Manager, the Deputy City Manager, the Economic Development Director, the Finance Director and Attorney Tom Merrigan; seconded by Councilmember Loo. All in favor.

The Mayor is requesting an executive session for purposes of a personnel matter.

MOTION 2: Mayor Muckle moved the City Council adjourn to executive session for the purpose of discussion of a personnel matter for informational purposes concerning an interim city manager services contract as authorized by the laws noted by the City Attorney and the executive session include the City Council and the City Attorney; seconded by Councilmember Keany. All in favor.

The City Council adjourned to executive session at 6:08 p.m.

The Special City Council meeting reconvened at 7:03 p.m.

REPORT – DISCUSSION/DIRECTION/ACTION – PENDING LITIGATION & PERSONNEL MATTERS

City Attorney Light reported while in executive session for discussion of pending litigation and personnel matter, no action was requested this evening for any of the items.

Mayor Muckle moved to continue the executive session to the end of regular meeting. Councilmember Keany seconded. All in favor.

ADJOURN TO REGULAR MEETING

REGULAR MEETING 7:00 PM

Call to Order – Mayor Muckle called the regular meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

City Council: *Mayor Robert Muckle*
 Mayor Pro Tem Jeff Lipton
 Councilmember Jay Keany
 Councilmember Chris Leh
 Councilmember Susan Loo
 Councilmember Dennis Maloney
 Councilmember Ashley Stolzmann

Staff Present: *Malcolm Fleming, City Manager*
 Heather Balser, Deputy City Manager
 Kevin Watson, Finance Director
 Kathy Martin, Recreation Superintendent
 Aaron DeJong, Director of Economic Development
 Rob Zuccaro, Director of Planning & Building Safety
 Lauren Trice, Associate Planner
 Kathleen Hix, Director of Human Resources
 Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

Others Present: *Sam Light, City Attorney*

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mayor Muckle called for changes to the agenda and hearing none, moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Councilmember Loo. All were in favor.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Chief John Willson, Louisville Fire Protection District, 895 Via Appia, stated he was here for his quarterly check in. City Manager Fleming noted the annual report showed the

department's rate of response time is getting better and better. Mayor Muckle thanked Chief Willson for the cooperation working with the Police Department. Councilmember Stolzmann noted the residents are receiving higher residential assessments. Chief Willson noted the Fire Department will actually be getting less money due to the Gallagher Amendment rules.

Keith Keller, 833 Jefferson Avenue, stated his support for the extension of the Historic Preservation tax and using some of that money to support the museum operations.

Paula Elrod, 828 Jefferson Avenue, stated her support for the Historic Preservation Tax extension and for up to 20% go to the operations of the History Museum.

Joe Teasdale, 1018 Griffith Street, also stated his support for the extension and funding of the museum.

Dan Mellish, 590 West Willow, agreed with the previous speakers for language to include the Historic Museum operations in the ballot language.

RJ Harrington, 457 East Raintree Court, stated he attended a recent conference on how to make the economy work in service to the planet. He stated this ties into the City with the Sustainability Action Plan, the energy action plan, and the Partners in Energy program. All decisions must consider the impacts on this and all future generations.

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Mayor Muckle moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Councilmember Loo. All were in favor.

- A. *Approval of Bills***
- B. *Approval of Minutes: May 2, 2017***
- C. *Approval of Contract with Kaiser Permanente for Health Insurance***
- D. *Approval of Proclamation for Gun Violence Awareness Day***
- E. *Approval to Start June 6, 2017 Meeting at 6:00 PM for an Executive Session***

COUNCIL INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS ON PERTINENT ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Fleming noted a wayfinding sign mockup will be installed soon near McCaslin Boulevard and Hwy 36. He welcomed comments on size, visibility, and location of the wayfinding mockup. The flowers have been put on Main Street, they may

be taken in if the snow forecast looks bad. Those in the Hecla Lake area have noticed the low water level. We are waiting for the ditch water to come in to fill it as soon as we can get access to the water.

REGULAR BUSINESS

**ORDINANCE NO. 1737, SERIES 2017 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 3.18 OF THE LOUISVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE AND ADOPTING AN UPDATED SCHEDULE OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES FOR TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL FACILITIES, LIBRARY CAPITAL FACILITIES, AND PARKS AND TRAILS CAPITAL FACILITIES – 2ND READING – PUBLIC HEARING
(advertised *Daily Camera* 05/07/2017)**

City Attorney Light introduced the ordinance by title, noting this is a second reading and public hearing.

Mayor Muckle opened the public hearing.

Deputy City Manager Balser stated this ordinance is to update the 2011 development impact fee structure, it removes reference to the municipal facilities and recreation facility fees which would no longer be charged, adds a new definition of floor area, and a new section providing a one-time exemption for construction of an addition to an existing dwelling unit of 200 SF or less or expansion of finished space of dwelling unit of 200 SQ or less. If approved, the ordinance would take effect July 1, 2017. The proposed library fee will be in effect until the final library debt service payment is made with staff presenting updates to reflect revised library impact fees at that time. This proposal was created by the Impact Fee Liaison Committee. They support the ordinance and suggest prior to the next update, a transportation master plan be conducted and the City Council look at alternative revenue sources as the city reaches build out. They suggest this take place before the next update in 5 years.

Councilmember Maloney thanked the members for their service and great participation. This is not what everyone wants, but there is consensus from the committee members.

Carson Bise, Tischler Bise, reviewed the update process. He noted there was a lot of community outreach in the process as well as meetings with the committee and staff. He noted changes in how the calculations were done for this study versus the 2011 study.

- Assess Residential Fees per Square Foot
- Combine Detached and Attached in “Single Family”
- Combine Nonresidential Categories
- Do Not Renew Municipal Facilities or Recreation Facilities Fees
- Including Neighborhood Parks

- Including Signalized Intersections
- Increased Costs for Park Improvement, Trails, and Pedestrian Improvements
- Incremental Expansion Used for Arterials

Mr. Bise noted the individual fee components are Library Fees; Parks & Trails Fees; and Transportation Fees. The Municipal Facilities fee and the Recreation Facilities fee are not recommended to be included.

This is a large increase since the last time this was done was during the recession and held the rates lower. This fee catches the City up to what it actually costs to maintain services. After 2018 the Library Fee would be reduced as the debt is paid off.

Mr. Bise noted the residential fee structure versus neighboring communities. Louisville is in the middle to low levels compared to neighbors; he added comparisons are not really apples to apples as each city may include different items in their fees and may not have updated their fees recently.

Councilmember Keany stated impact fees can only be used for capital costs, can this include capital costs for things like police. Mr. Bise noted state law limits how the impact fees can be spent for items such as vehicles.

Mayor Muckle asked if these fees would pay for the possible museum expansion and collections. Deputy City Manager Balser noted the museum is not in the 5-year CIP and these fees are tied to the 5-year CIP.

Hank Dalton, member of the Impact Fee Committee, commented the committee worked well together. He thanked Councilmember Maloney for his work. He noted the ordinance in section 5 includes language to exempt the first 200 square feet of a residential addition from the fee structure. This was compromise language among the committee. He recommended removing this language to simply allow those types of remodels as they won't have any impact on City services. Don't charge an impact fee for these types of additions.

Jim Vasbinder, member of the Impact Fee Committee, thanked Councilmember Maloney and Deputy City Manager Balser for their work with the committee. He stated the process was long and after a great deal of work he is comfortable with the recommendation to the Council.

Public Comments

Erik Hartronft, 950 Spruce Street, stated the impact fees are a concern to many in the business community as the fees seem to be going up at a fast rate all of a sudden and will affect many projects already in the works. He asked if the developer or the tenant pays the fee. Director Zuccaro stated impact fees are not charged on core and shell, only on the final tenant finish.

Mr. Hartronft stated the fees seem to encourage office, but should be incentivizing retail. He noted fees are going up close to 600% which causes alarm for developers. He supports paying for impacts but thinks perhaps this sends the message we are not open to development. He is afraid we are pricing out good development.

Randy Caranci, 441 Elk Trail, Lafayette, felt the process had not been transparent enough. The fee differences for office and industrial are tremendous. It makes Louisville seem not open for business. He inquired why BRaD (Business Retention and Development) did not weigh in on this ordinance. Taxes are going up too fast. Commercial and office are taking the brunt of this. He asked Council to put this on hold to get additional information.

Council Comments

Mayor Muckle noted impact fees are not used as incentives, we have other policies to address that. This is simply for new development to pay their fair share of impact costs.

Councilmember Loo asked Director Zuccaro how impact fees affect residential expansions. Director Zuccaro stated the new impact calculation is supposed to be a reasonable compromise where the cost is tied to finish work and is free up to the point where more residents are added.

Councilmember Maloney asked about Mr. Dalton's suggestion to remove the language concerning additions. He was not so concerned about a bedroom being added but more about the additions which might double or triple the size of the home.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated her support for the ordinance as proposed; she felt the committee made a good recommendation with a lot of work put in and there needs to be something to address adding square footage which will affect impact.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked if finishing a basement would trigger the impact fee. Director Zuccaro stated yes under this calculation; it adds more livable area which would be more likely to add more people to the community.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated if we don't use this approach we need to do a per unit basis. Councilmember Maloney agreed it correlates between square footage and number of persons in a home which relates to impact. It is a philosophy basis for the fee.

Councilmember Loo stated her concern the fee becomes cost prohibitive; people simply will do remodels without getting a permit which would make it less safe.

Councilmember Maloney asked where the 200 square foot exemption came from. Director Zuccaro stated this is enough to cover most finishes of a bedroom or bathroom but not something larger that would have a greater impact.

Mr. Bise stated impact fee structure is based on the lifespan of the house and improvements to a house are generally to allow for more people.

Mayor Muckle asked for additional public comments.

Randy Caranci stated the Council should further evaluate the concern with commercial, not just residential.

Hank Dalton noted the 200 square foot exemption could be raised to 500 square feet to reduce the perception of it being punitive to residents.

Mayor Muckle closed the Public Hearing

Councilmember Keany stated he was as concerned as Councilmember Loo that people are choosing not to get building permits when the process seems too onerous. He would prefer the process feel less punitive to homeowners getting permits.

Councilmember Leh stated the effort was to make this fair and reasonable. The concern is creating a rule people won't follow. We want to be consistent for all parties. He would support an exemption up to 500 square feet.

Mayor Muckle noted the numbers were from a good model for commercial. He stated he supports the ordinance as written. There are plenty of examples in old town where a house was renovated to allow more people to live in the house.

Councilmember Keany asked why the impact fee on commercial is so much higher. He has heard people will build office over commercial as it is cheaper.

Councilmember Maloney stated what the committee calculated was cost for those types of businesses.

Councilmember Maloney moved to approve Ordinance No. 1738, Series 2017 with changes in Section 5 for additions change 200 to 500 square feet and expansions change 200 to 500 square feet. Councilmember Loo seconded.

Mayor Muckle stated he wouldn't support 500 square foot added space as it really does impact neighborhoods with more people moving into those houses.

Councilmember Keany supported the 500 to renovations, not for additions. That would be an impact to the city.

Mayor Muckle supported 500 square feet for renovations to existing and leave 200 for additions.

Councilmember Loo asked how a renovation and an addition are defined. Attorney Light stated there is legal authority to propose different amounts of square footage in the implementation of the fee. Councilmember Loo asked Mr. Bise if the amount of square feet is proportional to the number of people brought in. He stated yes. Councilmember Loo noted in her neighborhood people are renovating for the existing family size, not to bring in more people or to sell. Mr. Bise stated one thing to keep in mind is the data is specific to Louisville today and will depend on the definition of renovation versus addition which will depend on how Louisville wants to implement the ordinance.

Councilmember Keany stated there should be an exemption of existing square footage but not for adding new square footage.

Motion recap: Section 5 B 8 to read:

Small Additions and Renovations for Residential Uses.

Construction of an addition to an existing dwelling unit of five hundred square feet or less, or expansion of finished space for an existing dwelling unit of five hundred square feet or less. This exemption shall only be used one time for each dwelling unit in existence on July 1, 2017.

Vote: Motion passed (**summary:** Yes = 5, No = 2, Abstain = 0).

Yes: Council Member Maloney, Council Member Stolzmann, Mayor Pro Tem Lipton, Council Member Loo, Council Member Leh.

No: Council Member Keany, Mayor Muckle.

RESOLUTION NO. 25, SERIES 2017 – A RESOLUTION SETTING THE PARKING IMPROVEMENT FEE FOR THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO

Director DeJong stated the parking improvement fee was established in 2000 as an elective fee to allow for paying into a fund for parking spaces rather than building on site when redeveloping downtown buildings.

Analysis

1. Cost to provide additional parking
2. Community Benefits of the Parking Improvement Fee
3. Consider the advantages and disadvantages
4. How other communities address the fee

Cost of providing a space analyzed three components; cost of land, construction costs and operations; then took out the high and the low to arrive at \$25,500.

Community benefit of Parking Improvement Fee

1. An Option – provides an option when site constraints make spaces difficult or extremely expensive
2. Shared Parking – is more efficient than single-use private parking because fewer spaces are needed to meet the total peak parking demand.
3. Better Urban Design – plan to not impede pedestrian or vehicle traffic
4. Fewer Variances – if fee is available, developers don't need waivers
5. Historic Preservation – having the fee makes it easier to preserve buildings

Advantages and disadvantages

- Developer Advantages of Fee
 - o Don't have to do large land assemblages
 - o Provides flexibility
- Developer Disadvantages of Fee
 - o If fee is set too high; developers may just construct the spaces and keep private
 - o Spaces for developments may not be conveniently located
 - o Parking regulation are determined by City

Need to balance competing interests. Director DeJong noted comparisons to different cities. Some are tied to the CPI or only charge for some costs. He gave some examples of what this might cost a new 5000 sf building which would require 8 parking spaces.

Determining the right amount is weighing benefits and obligations and encouraging public parking and the City's increased responsibility for parking.

Options – no change, full price, set less than full price to encourage developments to invest in public parking.

Staff recommends setting fee at \$13,000 per space for 2017 with increases in 2018 (\$14,000) and 2019 (\$15,000) then tie to the CPI if interested in having annual increases.

He noted BRaD felt the increase is high compared to current rate, setting the fee at \$13,000 per space would deter projects, fee rate should be informed by solutions in future planned parking analysis, parking plan should be in place to outline projects where fee would be spent, BRaD interested in having an interim amount greater than current and allowing time to create a parking plan outlining parking investments.

Councilmember Maloney asked how staff came up with \$13,000 as the discounted cost. Director DeJong stated it was a place for starting discussion but it is not a scientific number.

Erik Hartronft, 950 Spruce Street, stated the increase is significant and could make someone abandon plans with these new costs. A more phased approach would be

better. He suggested grandfathering in those PUDs already approved but may not have pulled a permit to trigger the fee. If set too high no one will ever pay into the fund. It is too low currently, but be careful it is not set too high.

John Leary, 1116 Lafarge Avenue, stated this parking discussion left out community disadvantages. Subsidizing parking is subsidizing re-development downtown. He encouraged more thought.

Erik Fowles noted this discussion may stop improvements to downtown that won't necessarily destroy the character. If too high it will limit improvements.

Rick Woodruff, 820 Mount Evans Court, loves the vibrancy of the community. Didn't know if fees are right or wrong, but he worries about sending messages to anyone who wants to invest in the community that this is a static community not a dynamic community. Wants to have change and create vibrancy.

Randy Caranci, 441 Elk Trail, Lafayette, stated that 500 County Road is a unique property in downtown and he always thought one day he could mezzanine that building, but if the cost is too high there is no way to pay for that parking. He asked Council to rethink this and put the conversation on hold.

Councilmember Keany stated the fee was too high in 2000 at \$10,000 and encouraged developers to remove homes for private parking. There is a benefit to shared parking. However it should have been increased from \$3500 every year since 2002. We would be at the \$13,000 if we had. He supports the 13,000 price but suggests there might be a way to help PUD's already approved, perhaps a grace period with some warning.

Councilmember Loo stated we are not making up for lost time. It is way too low, but she would like to see a less precipitous increase. Perhaps \$7500 is a good place to start and gives people more certainty in planning.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton suggested we need to determine the base cost of parking; \$25,500 and then determine what is the value of the public use. It should phase in over time to mitigate the shock. Start at \$13,388 go up so in four years will be at 100%. Fee should be set every year and not be static. Should act now before it gets worse.

Mayor Muckle was willing to start slower to ramp it up over time. Perhaps \$7500 to \$12000 to \$16000.

Councilmember Maloney stated the base calculation should be reset each year based on land values not CPI.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated everyone recognizes the public benefit of public parking. She is comfortable with Mayor Pro Tem Lipton's proposal but fees for parking shouldn't be subsidized for development; his approach is a step in the right direction.

Councilmember Keany would like to smooth the impact a bit more by adding \$3600 each year. Still concerned this is too big an impact on already approved PUDs. He suggested six month opening to pull permits for PUDs with lower fee, at \$3600 or maybe \$5000.

Councilmember Maloney agrees there needs to be an increase and noted there have not been a lot of developments paying the fee in lieu.

Councilmember Loo stated there is the optics that this may be saying "Louisville is not open for business." If set over \$10,000 we may be sending the message that we don't care. She suggested \$7500 and taking four years to get to the \$20,000 point. The residents she talks to want a vibrant downtown and are okay with this. If raising the fee to \$13000 hurts downtown she doesn't support it.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton noted everywhere other than downtown pays the full cost of parking.

Mayor Muckle felt public benefit is great, maybe 40%.

Councilmember Keany moved to approve Resolution No. 25, Series 2017 increasing the public parking improvement fee by \$3600 per year over the existing fee year one \$7200, year two \$10,800 year three \$14,400, year four \$18,000, year five \$21,600, with a 90-day grace period for existing PUDs to pull permits without an increase in the fee. Councilmember Loo seconded.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton suggested \$13,388 as the base adjusted every year by price index (CPI) and have the grace period be the end of the calendar year.

Councilmember Keany accepted grace period to the end of the year, but not the numbers/fee increases. Councilmember Loo agreed with Councilmember Keany.

Councilmember Stolzmann offered a substitute motion to approve Resolution No. 25, Series 2017 by starting with a base of \$13,388 in 2017, \$15,759 in 2018, \$18,261 in 2019, \$20,898 in 2020, after 2020 the fee will increase annually each January 1 by three percent and any final PUD approved by City Council prior to June 1, 2017, the fees shall take effect and apply to those building permits issued after December 31, 2017 for such approved development. Mayor Pro Tem Lipton seconded.

Vote on substitute motion:

Vote: Motion passed (**summary:** Yes = 4, No = 3, Abstain = 0).

Yes: Council Member Maloney, Council Member Stolzmann, Mayor Pro Tem Lipton, Mayor Muckle.

No: Council Member Loo, Council Member Keany, Council Member Leh.

**DISCUSSION/DIRECTION/ACTION – SUSTAINABILITY AND PRICING OPTIONS
FOR RECREATION CENTER EXPANSION**

Kathy Martin, Recreation Superintendent, noted as part of the successful November 8, 2016 bond election, the City committed to design and expand the Recreation Senior Center to meet LEED Gold Certification Standards, for sustainability, but not seek or fund formal certification. City staff has been working with the design team, Xcel Energy and Group 14 Energy Consultants to review and evaluate the current building baseline along with energy impacts associated with the remodel and expansion.

The project is proceeding under very ambitious schedule constraints. Accordingly, Council confirmation and/or direction is needed on the sustainability elements to ensure the design team incorporates all desired elements into the project and avoids delays that would occur if elements are added to the project at a later date.

Hillary Andren-Wise, Sink Holms Defleths and Anna McCullough with Group14 presented initial costs, payback, energy savings, Xcel Energy incentives and recommendations. Sustainability options above what is already in the design. The life cycle costs analysis shows lowest first cost, highest annual energy savings, shortest payback period. Many are already included in the design but there could be consideration of additional options. Options include changes to insulation, daylight sensors and additional LED lights.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked why demand control ventilation options with short payback were rejected. Ms. McCullough stated experience has been it has a high failure rate and additional costs.

Ms. McCullough, Group 14 showed the recommended proposal and noted this package would cost \$117,000 with a simple payback on energy use in 2 years.

City Manager Fleming clarified this base package is included in the base costs and there is no additional funding requested at this time. Staff is looking for confirmation this package is good and no one wants any additional items added which would require more funding.

Councilmember Stolzmann asked for more information on energy savings for the building for future discussion.

Public Comments

RJ Harrington, 457 East Raintree Court, asked 1) why only one package suggested 2) why wasn't entire list considered last year when cost was set in the bond issue 3) does the project align with the sustainability action plan and align with energy action plan 4) why use ASHRAE 2010 when 2013 and 2016 have been published 5) why using 4% discount rate - consider what affect on future generations 6) why 3% escalation in utility

rates 7) does cost base = current design 8) how does reducing insulation mass help efficiency 9) why economics only criteria, why not include environmental cost. Ultimately he asked if the only care is about money.

Deb Fahey, 1118 West Enclave Circle, agreed with previous speaker, more important things than money. Financially this is a very conservative estimate and we should consider longer return rate and higher costs. Should include all of it, the cost is worth it.

Councilmember Stolzmann asked if a decision is needed on these items now or if items can be added later and wouldn't more insulation help in the long run. Ms. Andren-Wise stated the insulation would be upgraded in the old part of the building but for the new part new technologies mean the insulation is sufficient.

Anthony Nemec, with construction management stated yes, decisions are needed now if the schedule is to be kept.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated this must be viewed as a system, trying to balance utility cost, comfort of patrons and maintenance. Looking for a package that works together. All of these options are a positive to the building and the system. If utility rates increase more than 3% these numbers look better, if decrease it will be a longer repayment time.

Mayor Muckle noted because we aren't doing everything doesn't mean we aren't doing a great deal. He voiced his support for this package.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton moved to accept the report and direct staff to move forward with the sustainability package as recommended. Councilmember Maloney seconded.

Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 7).

Yes: Council Member Leh, Council Member Keany, Mayor Pro Tem Lipton, Council Member Loo, Council Member Maloney, Mayor Muckle, Council Member Stolzmann.

PRESENTATION – REGIONAL AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLAN

Norrie Boyd, representing multiple jurisdictions in the County and the Housing Authority, noted they are looking for support of this regional affordable housing plan. Falling very short of immediate need for affordable housing in the County; rising costs, growing job center, lost affordable housing supply, lack of income keeping pace, land costs increasing, regional transportation problems and increased public concern about affordable housing. Average home sale prices and rents have had extraordinary increases. There are deep community concerns around lack of affordable housing. Commuting pressures include environmental impacts, stress on individuals and family, health impacts as well as commuters taking their money back to spend in their own community.

The goal is to build on regional partnerships and lessons learned:

- 10 year plan to address homelessness
- Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA)
- HOME consortium
- Flood Recovery Housing Working Group

Tremendous lessons were learned from the 2013 flood recovery. Longmont has found ways to improve affordable housing without a lot of funding. Regional partnership creates quality supportive affordable neighborhoods.

The regional plan has five priorities: Establish regional housing goals, bolster financial resources, secure land and redevelopment opportunities for future housing, preserve affordability of existing housing and align regulatory processes with housing goals.

The goal is to establish a county-wide affordable housing trust fund with a variety of potential funding sources. Ms. Boyd encouraged Louisville to be involved in the affordable housing summit and to provide feedback on the plan and its goals.

Councilmember Loo noted many residents don't like Kestrel because it was so dense and don't like the location. Residents appear to not be interested in any more dense projects. She asked what can be done that is affordable and not so dense. Ms. Boyd stated there are other ways to address this issue either with changing the housing or creative options to still maintain communities that are affordable.

Mayor Muckle stated the City is supportive of the plan.

Councilmember Leh noted there are a lot of different tools that can be used and the Council is open to considering some of those tools.

DISCUSSION/DIRECTION/ACTION – PROPOSAL FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE LEE AVENUE MINERS CABINS

Planner Trice noted this is an update and request for direction for the miner's cabins. Planning was able to get assessments done on the cabins and the cost estimate to move and rehabilitate the cabins is \$232,870.

Possible cabin locations:

- Hwy 42 and Pine
- Steinbaugh Pavilion
- Nawatny Greenway
- Miners Field
- Coal Creek Golf Course
- Aquarius Trail Head
- Cemetery
- Community Garden

Councilmember Maloney asked if these cabins are moved can we use HPF funds. Planner Trice, said yes, if they stay in the Historic Preservation area and landmarked at the new location, it can be used, but not if moved out of the overlay.

Mayor Muckle asked if the estimate includes moving costs. Planner Trice, replied yes within a two mile radius.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated she would like the HPC to review this for a recommendation. She would like to ask them to only consider relocations in which the HPF funds can be used and make a recommendation on the location and if this project should use the HPF.

Planner Trice noted the demo permit expires on June 13, 2017.

Mayor Muckle also would like a recommendation from the Historic Preservation Commission. He would likely only be supportive if HPF funds can be used.

Councilmember Loo stated moving and rehabilitating the cabins is not an appropriate use of general fund money.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked if money is spent on this, what we might not be able to afford later on.

Jean Morgan, 1131 Spruce Street, suggested simple stabilization and repair on one and place at Hwy 42 and Pine and second with full restoration at same location or Breaux Park, perhaps Miner's Field. Might be other ways to reduce the costs. Need visible location for the cabins. She is very concerned with the June 13th date and worried they might come down then. The fencing is historic as well. She noted the Daughters of the American Revolution may be interested in helping fund this with a grant. They need to be stabilized as soon as possible.

There was Council consensus to send to HPC for recommendations.

DISCUSSION/DIRECTION – CITY MANAGER RECRUITMENT PROCESS AND OPTIONS

Human Resources Director Hix stated the working group included options in the packet for the Council to consider. The group is looking for feedback on the Request for Proposals (RFP) and organizational assessment, and timelines.

Mayor Muckle stated perhaps the new City Manager would want to do his own assessment, but want to allow the community a chance to give feedback into the process.

Councilmember Maloney asked if the four week response for the RFP is typical. Director Hix stated yes. She would expect 7-10 responses, evaluate them based on criteria including processes and timelines and then do interviews.

Councilors had a timeline discussion. Consensus was to move this forward as fast as feasible.

Mayor Muckle will be talking to people individually about the working committee.

Councilmember Leh moved to approve the RFP, Councilmember Loo seconded.

Mayor Muckle offered a friendly amendment to give the mayor authority to make changes if not substantial. Motioner and seconder agreed. Vote: All in favor.

Mayor Muckle noted the organizational assessment will be fleshed out later.

ORDINANCE NO. 1738, SERIES 2017 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTERS 2.08 AND 2.12 OF THE LOUISVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE TO INCLUDE THE BENEFITS THE MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS SHALL RECEIVE IN ADDITION TO THEIR SALARIES – 1ST READING – SET PUBLIC HEARING 6/06/17

City Attorney Light introduced the ordinance by title on first reading noting any increase in salary or benefits for council members only apply after the seat on the council stands for election.

Mayor Muckle noted he is not supportive at this time. He would support doubling the salaries rather than tripling.

Mayor Muckle moved to approve Ordinance No. 1738, Series 2017 on first reading, send it out for publishing and set the public hearing for June 6, 2017; Mayor Pro Tem Lipton seconded. All in favor.

Mayor Muckle moved to continue the executive session to June 6. Councilmember Leh seconded. All in favor.

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

None.

COUNCIL COMMENTS, COMMITTEE REPORTS, AND IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mayor Muckle noted former councilmember Sackett's memorial service.

Councilmember Leh reported on the Legal Review Committee meeting from last week. He noted the Committee will not be supporting enacting a noise ordinance at this time. This item will come to Council for consideration. They will be bringing a non-profit policy for consideration.

ADJOURN

Members adjourned the meeting at 11:13 PM.

Robert P. Muckle, Mayor

Meredyth Muth, City Clerk